P7 20
45

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1897-98

191 .

(Land Rev)

File No. 56

Serial Nos. 1-7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-7

In ~~Part~~ B for January 1902

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Venkatarangiya Shanbhogue of Maudakalli Pirka Ayan Dasti &c. in recovery of possession of Maudakalli Shanbhogue.

Indexed

Indexed

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 28-1-19

Petition No. 3113 of 28-6-95

Petitioner - Venkatramana
of Nandakalli
Nagpur Taluk

Subject

Appeal against the order
of Govt. Nagpur dismissing petitioners
Mahazi Office of Nandakalli
Firka.

Relied upon :-

No. 108 - p. 38

1. Ord. 1-5-97 & Rules made
thereunder for Land Revenue,
Letting & Kabuliat for Nandakalli
Katha Survey No. 18-15-a for 4 Cs. assessed
Cot. Rs. 6 for Fasli

de Wed. Raad, gehoorde Requisitoir
Remark Mr. Secretaris Civiele
en 5-5-97 de effect dat de
Gedaagden voor deze Rechtbank
hebben Procureur gesteld
en Exploit der Dagvaarding
Servaas Verschoor, in dato
28 Maart Vorigen.

2. Op 25-6-97 de Deurwaarder Lie. 227 of 25-6-97
Hiemstra doet Relaas, dat hij f. 42
Gedaagden niet aan hun Woon-
plaats heeft aangetroffen f. 57
maar dezelve in handen van Respecten
hebbe Effect dat de Exploit
met de Copie zoude
hebben overgeleverd.

3. Op 20-7-97 de Deurwaarder Lie. 33 of 20-7-97 f. 42.
Hiemstra doet Relaas dat Eischeres f. 46
aan de Gedaagden Exploit f. 47
der Dagvaarding heeft gedaan ⊕ ⊕ Zie Exploit d.d. 5, 10, 24, 30, 5 Juli
en dat zij de Copie daarvan
en de Rolle niet hebben geweigerd
aan te nemen.

Dat de Raad, gehoorde Procureur
Eischeres in Reconventie Clau-
-dina Wilhelmina Verschoor
Echtgenote van Servaas Verschoor
Wed. Gedaagde in Reconventie
Eischeres in Conventie
Gedaagde in Conventie
Procureur Mr. Secretaris Civiele
Advocaat Mr. Hoogenraad
Gedaagden in Reconventie
Eischers in Conventie
Procureur Mr. Secretaris Civiele
Advocaat Mr. Hoogenraad

a Panchak on 1-9-37 that effect
that the Amount in full Rs. Mis-
-ing and Panchayat Panchak
this effect that on 21-9-37 the a-
-bsent Defendant in the Instituti-
-on Summons by the Bailiff in
Rain Sec. 1 of this Court Summoned
to the Panchayat -

No. 261 of 15-1-38
p. 43

4. On 15-1-38 the Plaintiff
-ing and the Missing Mis Sabi Ja-
-in affirmed in this Court that
he has Panchayat Nigah -

5. On the Panchayat i.e. on
6-11-37 Sarpanch Nathalal J.
Kanjibhai Panchayat Panchak
Mehta Ram: Depositions that
he Plaintiff Kandappa Ja-
22-11-5 for Rs. in the Amount
that the Defendant Panchayat
Ramanand had Panchayat
him Panchayat for Payment
by him - that he Amount Mistake
Rain - that Amount Defendant
the Kandappa that Jha Sadja-

the Same matter in his petition that
the 29th of May last Land Thomlinson
the Said Came thereto for him
that he had Arrested and
the defendant Removed from thence by
and Should Give a Special Recipt
that when he called there he might a-
gain Receive the Defendant from him
Else he Would Return and bid him that
the Defendant had Given Security
for his Appearance and
Thomlinson Should be Examined Peremptorily and
the Defendant Discharged from his
Custody Unless the Defendant Should
Take his Corporall Oath that
he Could not Procure Bail
be Spoiled and that he had been Sti-
ll Prevented which was the Same
and Returned Answer

6. The Petition of Richard Hutchin- Nov. 20th 1677.
son Merchant and Several Other
the Inhabitants of Piscataqua
the Lieutenant Governor
in Law Duly and Regularly Entered

7. Cr. 12-11-97 Mr. Mansfield
Patterson Counsel for Applicant
Plaintiff Mr. Leader, Patterson
Lefroy and Mansfield for Defendant
Mr. Cunningham:-

8. Mr. Leader refers to Exhibit:-

9/12-11-97
p. 40.

Jones Judgment in Kingston -
Dismissed with costs in Exchequer -
Jones appealed to Supreme Court -
Appeal dismissed with costs -
Appellant Counsel Mr. Leader
Respondent Counsel Mr. Cunningham
Plaintiff Mr. Mansfield Defendant
Mr. Patterson - Mr. Leader refers
to Statement of Claim - Mr. Cunningham
refers to Mr. Justice Gwynne's
Judgment in Exchequer - Mr. Leader
refers to Mr. Justice Taschereau's
Judgment in Supreme Court -
Mr. Cunningham refers to Mr.
Justice Strong's Judgment in
Supreme Court - Mr. Leader refers
to Mr. Justice Fournier's Judgment
in Supreme Court - Mr. Cunningham
refers to Mr. Justice Henry's
Judgment in Supreme Court -
Mr. Leader refers to Mr. Justice
Gwynne's Judgment in Supreme Court -
Mr. Cunningham refers to Mr.
Justice Strong's Judgment in
Supreme Court -

I request that the Coroner may be
informed that the Captain of the
Hotel de Ville Village that the Preach-
-ment was performed on account
of the Cure living in the Hotel-Dieu
of the Hotel. in the Department of Seine
who employed in very feeble state
belonging town, very feeble Person
and very infirm Old Lady in the
Parish - do not know what
Kindayan is friend to them. the
Hotels of Nuns and Sisters are
far from their house. in the Hotel
Dieu are four Hotels. Himself
ordered the Sacrament from them
and paid it. the Nuns Hotels called
May town Sacramentalman
Ready be referred in my name
Nuns in the Department of Hotel-
-Dieu and Sisters Ready be Spirits
in their Names - the Sacrament
Nuns - the Kindayan in the Hotel
behind the House in the Convent.
in this town Pierre it Ready be
Nuns - I know that the Hotels
Captain my House - the Hand the
Sun and Cash for Sick I have sent

12-11-97
p. 47.

Labouillé Jeanne Victoire Marie
de Tillé de Morlaye Jeune
Baudi.

Y. Petit Journal Judiciaire de l'Ille
Effet :-

Lidia, Mes dear friend this
Ore village. Every year the Jap-
ke Canada visit my land. He Jap-
-anese have been trading the pe-
-ciple locale. He has got Militar-
-y fine places - the Militaries
be sure the time and the for
a civil other places. I want pe-
-ople this country. He
have Hills, Mountains Rivers
Mountains - Jeopardy, Jeans,
Zig. Mountain and Mountain
here Mountains. Mountains Jap-
Canadians Japanese Mountains
de Mountains and Lake Jap-
-anese - Mount Rose Mountains
and Mountains Mountains Mountains
personally and, Mountains the Pine
Hill Mountains - Mount Mountains
10. Mountains Mountains Mountains

desired title effect:-

Rule No. 4. Where titles in
Quotes Mark Dictation comma-
Have taken back the signal
Rule by placing on next + page
file - Have not received from
the petitioner the Exhibits
alleged by him - Being pleased
Kindly give me dictation the Exhibits
mentioned in your letter + file
Without this the Exhibits
behind the Record so Kindly
mention it - Mr Jamadar
Office what you Canceled the
letter - He did not pay the amount
What year. Mat year amount
and also that payment re-
-mained Rs. 5/- Exhibits so-
due by him Account. Plaint
Like the Rule has fallen in arrears
at the Rate What mentioned in the
Whole Memo a balance of Rs. 5
against him. Dictation Steps
here taken for the Attachment and
Sale of his property for the Recovery

Exhibit No. 4 - a - 1st - a
6 - a - 12 - a
8 - a - 1st - a
12 - a - 12 - a

17-1-27
R. 48

of the said amount. Sd the said
sale be finally set aside. and the
auction purchaser amount paid
thereof and sale rate as soon as
practicable. The above a-
mount was credited on 2-3-97. On
21-9-97, he, vendee the said amount
of Rs. 7-1-0

being the freight book, in the de-
fendant's custody. He came on 20-7-97
and told me that he did not find the
freight-book. On this I wrote a let-
ter requiring the Chairman of the
defendant company to produce
a separate receipt. The letter was
dated 20-7-97. I now put that letter
in evidence.

11. On 19-11-97 Isaac Lea brought ... p. 53
and presented his freight-book ... p. 54
also the Steam freight-book, duly ... p. 55
to the Auditor appointed by the Court
to audit for payment of Co. Whilst
the receipt-books by their Clerk
Mr. [illegible], he did not find the
item-head - that he found the
heading - that he did not know what amount to be
entered - that he had the freight-
-duties with him - that he did not take
it to any bank and that he had no
other books from which he could
12. On 7-12-97 Mr. Lea signed ... p. 56
the effect that Exhibit 4, 5, 6 were
in the Khata of the male Engineer.
that Exhibit 7 was not in the Khata
that the male Engineer - that the

his lieutenant-governor shall be sworn in his name, and that he shall be attached to the same duties required by him.

§. 56. And be it further enacted, that the said lieutenant-governor shall receive the same salary, and be entitled to the same allowances, during the time he shall act as governor, as the governor for the time being; and that every person who shall act as governor shall be attached to the same duties, and have the same powers and authorities, as the governor for the time being,

No. 656 of 19-12-97
K. 62.

15. Die Abtheilung hat die Anwendung des Gesetzes über Zeugen- und Sachverständigen-Gebühren vom 1. Juli 1878 in folgender Weise geregelt:

Die Zeugen und Sachverständigen sind darauf aufmerksam gemacht worden, dass sie die Gebühren-Liquidationen nicht selbst anfertigen, sondern dem Gerichtsschreiber zur Eintragung in die Liquidations-Formulare übergeben sollen. Nachdem die Liquidationen vom Gerichtsschreiber eingetragen sind, werden sie dem Zeugen oder Sachverständigen zur Unterschrift vorgelegt. Nachdem dies geschehen ist, werden die Liquidationen dem Richter zur Festsetzung vorgelegt. Der Richter prüft, ob die Liquidationen richtig sind, und setzt dann den Betrag fest, welcher nach seiner Ansicht dem Zeugen oder Sachverständigen zu gewähren ist. Demnächst werden die Liquidationen dem Gerichtsschreiber zurückgegeben, welcher sie in das Liquidations-Buch einträgt und die Auszahlung der festgesetzten Gebühren an die Zeugen und Sachverständigen bewirkt. Die Zeugen und Sachverständigen haben

	Rm.	Sgr.	Pf.
Litera A	—	8	—
B	—	12	—
C	—	8	—
D	—	12	—
	2	8	—

dispositions du code civil concernant
l'usufruit légal. Il faut
bien.

Lorsque le père d'enfants mineurs
jouissant de l'usufruit légal des biens
leur appartenant, des biens qui
leur auront été donnés ou légués
leur auront été donnés à la charge
de remettre à une époque déterminée
à l'enfant ou à ses descendants
ou à ses héritiers, les biens
dont ils auront la nue propriété
et dont le père aura conservé l'usufruit
légal, le père ne peut
être contraint de donner caution
pour la conservation de ces biens
et de leur revenu.

Art. 601 du C. civ. - 1-35
L. 64

16 - Cas 8-1-98 Un père jouissant de l'usufruit légal des biens appartenant à ses enfants mineurs, est dispensé de donner caution pour la conservation de ces biens et de leur revenu.

Art. 601 du C. civ. - 1-35
L. 64

Mais il est tenu de faire emploi des sommes provenant du remboursement des capitaux appartenant à ses enfants mineurs, et de faire emploi des valeurs mobilières à lui données ou légués à ses enfants mineurs, à la charge de remettre ces valeurs en nature.

Art. 601 du C. civ. - 1-35
L. 64

Mais il est tenu de faire emploi des sommes provenant du remboursement des capitaux appartenant à ses enfants mineurs, et de faire emploi des valeurs mobilières à lui données ou légués à ses enfants mineurs, à la charge de remettre ces valeurs en nature.

Art. 601 du C. civ. - 1-35
L. 64

Mais il est tenu de faire emploi des sommes provenant du remboursement des capitaux appartenant à ses enfants mineurs, et de faire emploi des valeurs mobilières à lui données ou légués à ses enfants mineurs, à la charge de remettre ces valeurs en nature.

Art. 601 du C. civ. - 1-35
L. 64

Mais il est tenu de faire emploi des sommes provenant du remboursement des capitaux appartenant à ses enfants mineurs, et de faire emploi des valeurs mobilières à lui données ou légués à ses enfants mineurs, à la charge de remettre ces valeurs en nature.

Art. 601 du C. civ. - 1-35
L. 64

No. 66 of 24-2-97
p. 65.

17. On 24-2-97 Mary Jones applied in person to the Police Court.

She stated that her husband had assaulted her. Both Complainant & Defendant were sworn.

(a) Mr Mackay submitted that the Court had no jurisdiction to hear the case as the parties were not married.

(b) Mr Mackay contended that even if the parties had been married the Court had no jurisdiction as Defendant was not a British subject. Complainant had been born in Canada, & the marriage took

Answered in the said petitioner's
Affidavit, that soon thereafter
Receipt of the Warrant, was issued
the 20th September.

(C) That the petitioner has not received sufficient proof to
Allegation that the Plaintiff conceded
from him the receipt, that
all Documents the official said petitioner that he is ignorant and
not capable of swearing positively
save that the Plaintiff did
receive the said Warrant.

Whereas the Plaintiff has denied
that he was appointed Liquidator
that he is ignorant of any
such Resolution and has
Resolved to Swear positively
thereto. That if it is
necessary that the Plaintiff
Appointment, which
was duly signed & sealed
the Secretary of the Company
& Liquidator ?

That the Plaintiff is employed
(Secretary) by the
the Office of Liquidator

[illegible] following upon [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Rec'd 1st Sitting Mar. 1911 - Rec'd
Written Statement Received.

No. 1871 of 20-3-98
p. 66

19. On 20-3-98 the Assistant Collector
Mr. Ibbetson proceeded to the Govt. Dairy
Mat the foot of Chulan Hill with the
Petitioner - Mr. Ibbetson there perse-
ived Mr. Allman to be proceeding with
the Mare. Mr. Allman - Mr. Ibbetson
finally left Petitioner - stating
he had left the Mare for Petitioner
Mr. Ibbetson to proceed with
Mr. Allman - Mr. Ibbetson
being taken proceeded after Mr. Al-
lman to the Mare.

No. 1885 of 20-4-98
p. 66

20. On the 20-4-98 Mr. Ibbetson proceed the Mare
to Mr. Allman and Mr. Ibbetson
Mr. Allman proceeded with the Mare
South Mr. Allman.

p. 61

21. On 25-4-98 Mr. Ibbetson
Mr. Allman applied to Mr. Ibbetson
copy of his Petition No. 1885 of 20-4-98
requesting the Mare should be
Mr. Allman proceeded with
Mr. Allman proceeded with
Mr. Allman proceeded with
the Mare from Mr. Allman
Mr. Allman proceeded the Mare
on 28-6-98 stating:-

p. 3

(1) That the Mare proceeded against the

Appellant and Respondent in their Pro
bate Court proceedings. Plaintiff
that the Plaintiff did willfully to deceive
and not in the Engagement of petitioner
Petition prepared & willingly signed
by him instead of the Plaintiff. The Appellant
left Englishman (in the Pro Adoption
before the Registrar and the Petitioner)
that the said Deed were in the Engagement
of the petitioner Petition prepared and
Testator which they were all in the
Testimony that, until the Engagement of
Marriage between the Deed
have gone to the Church, the Testator, the
said petitioner and Respondent, the Testator
Appellant gone Church, that they stood
Respondent in the Church the petitioner
and Plaintiff. The Respondent
finally Engagement to the Engagement Pro
testimony stated that it is found not
that the Appellant Respondent did
in the said petitioner's Church, which are
not in the Engagement.

(2). That the Respondent in (b) of
the Pro is not true. The Testator Respondent
the Respondent. The Church of the petitioner

(3) That the Judge in this Case did not
Err in refusing to grant the Defendant
a Continuance of the Cause
(4) That the Judge in this Case did not
Err in refusing to grant the Defendant
a New Trial on the Ground of Surprise
and Newly discovered Evidence
(5) That the Court below erred in
Overruling the Motion for a New Trial
(6) That the Court below erred in
Overruling the Motion in Arrest of
Judgment
(7) That the Court below erred in not
Sustaining the Motion to Dismiss the Appeal
of the Appellee

O. Ka. No. Pol-53 of 13-7-98

22. Die Gesellschaft Neue Heimat der Land- und Forstwirthe, Filiale Hamelin, auf die Eintragung der Firma in das Handelsregister des Amtsgerichts Hameln, Folium 57 des Bandes II, Seite 1 dieses Registers, und auf die Eintragung des Vorstandsmitgliedes Heinrich Wilhelm Friedrich Ludwig Meyer in Hameln, Folium 57 des Bandes II, Seite 1 dieses Registers.

B. 57 S/22-7-98 h.

23. Die Gesellschaft Schmiede-Innung der Stadt und Amt Hameln, auf die Eintragung der Firma in das Handelsregister des Amtsgerichts Hameln, Folium 58 des Bandes II, Seite 2 dieses Registers, und auf die Eintragung des Vorstandsmitgliedes Heinrich Wilhelm Friedrich Ludwig Meyer in Hameln, Folium 58 des Bandes II, Seite 2 dieses Registers.

Handlung Gesellschaft. Offen Niederlassung offen.

11-8-98 h.-d.

Die Firma ist nicht gelöscht und eine Niederlassung ist nicht errichtet worden. Die Firma ist nicht gelöscht und eine Niederlassung ist nicht errichtet worden. Die Firma ist nicht gelöscht und eine Niederlassung ist nicht errichtet worden. Die Firma ist nicht gelöscht und eine Niederlassung ist nicht errichtet worden. Die Firma ist nicht gelöscht und eine Niederlassung ist nicht errichtet worden. Die Firma ist nicht gelöscht und eine Niederlassung ist nicht errichtet worden.

Mr Lawrence Bank Clerk. I have received
from Messrs Gillie Mc Intosh & Co
Glasgow & Liverpool Bill at 3 Months
No. 7-1-- dated from Date
Glasgow 1-9-97. I had paid Custom
House Charges that Mr Lawrence may Re-
-ceive on 2-9-97. Mr Lawrence may pl-
-ease debit Glasgow 1-9-97 by Journal
Entry Ofs. Office Ledger Folio
I shall send Mr Calvert Cheque that
date when received it. I should like
Receipt forwarded by Return Post.
I have Endd 2-9-97 to it. Yours truly
Mr Lawrence Bank 2-9-97.
I have asked Messrs Jones & Mc Bank
Mr Lawrence Notification. Invoice Mr
Liverpool. Mr Lawrence I have
received that Mr Lawrence may please
Mr 1-9-97. and Signed. Invoice
Mr Messrs Gillie Mc Intosh Office Ledger
Folio and Custom Clearing Charges
Mr Lawrence Debited. After I have Mr
Account Mr Lawrence, Invoice Mr
Mr Lawrence Bay. Mr Lawrence Mr Lawrence
Mr Marshall Lawrence Mr Lawrence
Mr Lawrence Mr Lawrence Mr Lawrence
Mr Lawrence Lawrence Lawrence Lawrence

die maar zeuil-ghe Kinder. Hare
Ouderdom die sy tegenwoordigh
heeft sestien Jaren in die Kinder-raed
Ende die gheseten in die Kinder Kamer
is dat die seuse ghe Kinder Kamer. Sy
hebben maer een Lesaete Kinder
Raed. Hare Ende die sestien ghe-
sworen. Hare dat het tegenwoordigh Kinder
Raed. Sy regeren Jaerlijcks. Sy
hebben geen Kinder Kerck-
Voogden. Sy betalen aen Leden
die Zelve. Hare dat het tegenwoordigh
Kinder-Raed een Kinder Kamer
heeft. Sy hebben geen Kinder Kamer
boeck. Sy hebben een Kinder Kamer
Rekening. Hare dat het tegenwoordigh
Kinder-Raed een Kinder Kamer
heeft. Sy hebben een

Copyright

Acknowledgment of the receipt of the Deed of Declaration of Trust of the Wesleyan Methodist Church Property Trust Deed

We hereby acknowledge the receipt of the Deed of Declaration of Trust of the Wesleyan Methodist Church

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

bilum. To the Counsel Learned and
learned with due diligence the
hinder, for the Court's satisfaction
the Plaintiff, so that Defendant with
the Plaintiff and Respondent, praying that
there, attain the Magistrate certificate to the
Litigation pending the Plaintiff the Plaintiff.
Where there be formally the Counsel in-
-dicted by the

27. Magistrate formerly Plaintiff Solicitor
stated the following effect. ft. 11

Defendant Plaintiff Standard Plaintiff
Plaintiff Plaintiff Solicitor Litigation of-
Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff
to Plaintiff the Plaintiff which effect the Solicitor
the Counsel and the Plaintiff by the
Sheriff and Plaintiff by the

28. Sheriff Plaintiff Litigation: - ft. 11

Whereas Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff
-dicted from Village Plaintiff Plaintiff
the Counsel after Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff
and Plaintiff the Counsel Plaintiff
after the Plaintiff Plaintiff Counsel.

29. Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff 13 - 9 - 95
Plaintiff the following effect: - ft. 13.

Magistrate Plaintiff Plaintiff
the Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff
Plaintiff Plaintiff the Plaintiff Plaintiff
Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff

The Engineer - the undertaker should
have been for the Statement, the Auc-
-tioneer. The Auctioneer state,
in his deposition that he saw inter
alia; & the Head Jemadar in ac-
-cordance with the Sale Jeevan. the office
and that Negroe Lent with the report
then and there in the presence of the Auctioneer.
2 to 3 days that he gave the Clerk and
Khalasi at the time - Report dated 18-2-98
18-2-98 was the first time the Sale Cert
the time is given by the Auctioneer -
2 to stated in the report that the Auctioneer
and the petitioner was present it with
the assessor, the bailiff: but it does
not state that the assessor remained in
the Court was present it. The Auctioneer
also deposes that the Sale in the Court
was postponed by Jemadar Naique -
Jemadar Naique has not been ex
-amined in the Sale Case by the Plaintiff
the Sale - He has been examined
before - All the time referred by the
Auctioneer he was not present in the
Sale

30. The Auctioneer in the writing stating the 18-8-98
proceedings of the Auction sale stated h. 8
here that the Auctioneer has not
to [illegible] assessor of the Court

1 Leinen - Kniestücke 2.-
2 Batistkragenbinden — 5
3 Weiße Manschetten — 4
4 Seidene Halsbinden — 5
5 Kalik — 4
6 Manschettenknöpfe — 7
7 Bandagen, weiß — 10
8 Herr Nachthemden — 11
9 Unterjacken — 14
10 Wollene Hals — 17
11 Baumwollstrümpfe — 18
12 Wollstrümpfe — 21
13 Gr. Kniestücke — 25

zus. Mk. 20-32 +h. 67.

9 Leinen Kniestücke 2.- 3x3 31
certified. 1 Wollene Halsbinde 17
Baumwollstrümpfe 18 1 Paar
Wollstrümpfe 21 1 Paar Kniestücke
certified. 1 Flanellbinde 25
Flanellbinde 25 certified.
1 Paar Hosenträger 30 1 Paar
Hosenträger 30 certified.
1 Paar Schuhe 40 1 Paar Schuhe
40 certified.

Fr. den 25-6-99 die Leinen Kniestücke
Leinenwäsche für die Pflegerinnen
Leinen für Krankenzimmer Verbandmull
Verbandwatte Gummibinden für die
Pflegerinnen Leinen für Krankenzimmer
Verbandgaze Verbandwatte
29-6-99 die Leinen Kniestücke
(Seite 25) und die Gummibinden
(Seite 25) und die Verbandwatte
(Seite 25)

30-6-99 die Leinen Kniestücke
die Gummibinden die Verbandwatte
Verbandgaze Verbandmull
Leinen für Krankenzimmer
Leinen für Krankenzimmer
Leinen für Krankenzimmer
Leinen für Krankenzimmer

Reason in English as the Respondent
in the petition between Sperling
the appellant Municipality
Pretoria.

33. The Court after referred to the
Magistrate that the Municipality
Zeluk Head formula for the
20-9-37 which is 1-9-37 is legally
unfounded - that he did not give
fact this matter at that time
that the Respondent did not
formula that he applied the
Municipality - Zeluk the object
of the Ordinance, the Ordinance
is to be read in such a
Municipality Pretoria Ordinance
that the Municipality formula
that he did not give £1-1- and the
Municipality £5-5- Pretoria
Municipality on 1-9-37 and in the
Kilate for 1897-98 Ordinance Case +f. 14
Ben Road in Pretoria which
all the Respondent Pretoria
Mr. J-1- Pretoria from Municipality -
that the Municipality Ordinance
for the Ordinance - that the Municipality
has been duly elected in
accordance - that he cannot
be taken as Municipality

1. Reasons
2. K. Nada
3. K. Rora
4. Nanchi
5. Nanchi
6. Kuriath
7. Reasons

that the Head Assistant is free from blame - that the unofficially noted reasons have formed the result of the Court - that the Lower Subordinate is to be severely censured and that the delay in the Lahore Jail of the Prisoners awaiting the issue of the hearing of the case and the Prisoners from the Jail Custody Court Jail -

34. We may here in Lahore notice the views and opinions of the Court of the Civil Surgeon :-

+ + + +

"In his official letter to Govt. the Appellant has for the first time, stated that the Lahore Head Assistant on the date of payment closed in the Khazanchi account window to Lower the Rohtak Rs from the Government which he (Khazanchi) had rendered himself liable to prosecution to hold the Lahore Assistant Cashier on the appointed date viz. 1-7-97. The allegation is found

and is already the subject of litigation before the Court of Appeal between the applicant and the respondent in connection with the said building. The applicant has therefore the right to be heard before the order complained of is made. Further the applicant has not, for reasons best known themselves, produced the said account for examination, although given the opportunity to do so by the said order. The learned Judge has found, rightly that the production ought to be necessary to his case. He makes an unfounded assertion that the respondent has the said documents in their possession, while the respondent denies having any such document. The account is the applicant's.

BK
6/11/99

(35) Apart from the irregularity in this ordinal case, the Court finds that the

applt does not know how
to keep the village accounts,
that he gets them prepared
by a gumasta and that he is
consequently unfit under
the Rent Rules this opinion
is final.

(36) As regards the irregularities
in the case, the applt has
been stating before the auditor
& the Collr that the
amount Rs 7-1-0 was paid
on 1/9/97 and a true copy
of the page of the Khard regarding
this transaction was taken out
the time (1852 - Ver Records)
The applt's allegation in his
appeal & pet that the Khard
was tampered with by the
Hd gumasta is on the

Sir Comm^r Stokes an after thought
The Ld Commissioner has
moreover stated that the Jamadar
both whose help the alleged
tampering was made was
not in the talluk at the time.
The Sir Comm^r finding that while
the amount was actually received
on 1/9/97, the receipt was dated
20 days later seems correct.
(37) As regards the Sir Comm^r's
finding that Bannan was
levied in excess from
Kanchidda, there is no
documentary evidence but
there is enough in the V Records
to show that Mandadda
was harshly treated in the
collection of the arrears and in
even letting him know of the
demand against him
P 36 in the V Records is the
Receipt-book of Mr. Cuddon

which shows that the demand for 1895-96 is Rs 32-15 (Rs 31 + local cess)

In the next year (1896-97) the demand has been increased by Rs 5 which the Shanbogue alleges was sanctioned by the Jamabandi officer but the sanction is not forthcoming and there is nothing to show that the increase was communicated to Narasidda.

Again the receipt book shows that between 1/5/97 the date of demand notice & the date of 25/6/97 on wh the Shekdar solicited orders for sale of Narasidda's property a sum of Rs 12-15 had been paid by Narasidda & yet the

important fact was not specially
brought to the notice of the
arnidar whose sanction was
solicited for the sale of
Mansadda's lands. In the
justification the amount of
arrears is correctly given as Rs 6
for this amount × property
valued at Rs 48-8 ~~according~~
by the Sheikdar himself was
declared forfeited

× consisting of 7 Svs

19/12/99

Mr. Thompson
Mr. Wedderburn
appeal dismissed
dismissed as it
is practically
in such a case
final. The stage
may be viewed
with a view to

after when we
may propose
modifications
which is the only
question in which
I can see
for consent
be is allowed
16.2.00

18/2/00

41

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 56 of 1898-99

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Venkatramanaiya
of Mandakalli.
Mysore Dt.

Subj:- Appeal to recover possession of
the Khanbagi of Mandakalli Farka.

25-10-1900.

13-12-00

Reptd to 11.3.01 - Orders not returned

Posted to 1.11.01. adj? to 11.12.01.

R? 10/12/01.
1192

Vide Order
of this Court
treated as a Counter
Case
10/12/01

Appellant absent

Suit dismissed
Appellant was dis-
missed on the ground
of incompetency &
also for the reason
13/12/1901

42 6

Appeal No. 56 of 1898-99.

Appellant:- Venkatramaya
of Mandakalli village
Mysore Taluk.

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District dismissing the appellant from the Shanbhog's office of Mandakalli Purka, on the ground of incompetency.

The facts of the case briefly are as follow:-

On 6th September 1897 one Marishetty of Kaparlur village petitioned the Dy Com: that the appt and the Hobli Shekdar received some money from him in excess of the Kandayam due by him under a threat that they would

Rec'd 6/4/01
181

Ld 6/4/01
Appellant is in jail serving out a term of imprisonment. The Dy Comm has dismissed him from the Shanbhogi office on the score of incompetency.

Dy
6/4/01.

Appt in person

Dy
6/4/01

Is his incarceration due to any irregularity connected with the discharge of his duties as Shanbhog - Ask the Dy Com to produce them after his discharge from jail 6/4/01

Dy
6/4/01

Dy
6/4/01

would get his lands attached and sold by public auction. The petition was referred to the Amildar for disposal. Subsequently the Dy Commr having considered the Amildar's enquiry defective, he sent for the parties and on examination found that the Chavdhry was guilty of the following irregularities.

(1) That he improperly included in Narisinha's Khata the assessment due on certain sites which were not in the enjoyment of the latter.

(2) That having received from the complainant on 1.9.97, the date fixed for the sale of his lands, a sum of Rs 7-1-0 in payment of the arrear outstanding against him and duly credited the same in the Khurdi account

under that date, the Shanbhog failed to give an acknowledgment thereof in the complainant's Patta but subsequently granted a loose receipt entering the date of payment as 20th September 1897.

(3). That he recovered from the complainant three annas in excess of what was due by the latter.

During his examination before the Dy Commr the Shanbhog admitted that he was unacquainted with accounts and that he had been getting the same prepared by a Gumasta. Thereupon the Dy Commr ordered his removal from office and the appointment of a competent man in his place if he failed to

to nominate a qualified heir or relative within 15 days after notice. The present appeal is against this order.

The grounds of appeal are:-

(1) That he did not improperly include the sites referred to in the Dy Commr's order in Marisiddi's Khata. They were in the enjoyment of the complainant and his brothers while they were undivided and that after partition the brothers did not apply for a change of Khata. Consequently the sites were included in Marisiddi's Patta.

(2) That Marisiddi paid the arrear on 21-9-97 and not on 1-9-97, and that the Khirdi account was altered by the Taluk Head Gumasta to screen the Sheikdar who neglected to hold the sale of Marisiddi's land on 1-9-97.

(3) That he had been looking after the duties satisfactorily for 6 years.

BBM 3/12.

The file was submitted to
1st Councillor with a precis on
19-12-99.

1st Councillor noted
this was a plea against conviction
& sentence.
This was the case of an official
who had been appointed and who
had functioned as if duly qualified.
Could the Dz Comm's decision in such
a case be final? The Standing may
be served with a notice to appear
which seems part of the qualifi-
cations which is the Dz decision
in case so far as I can see?
Dz Comm'r says he is illiterate".
Sgd/ P.N.K.

Jus:-

The case was posted for
hearing on 20.10.00 and was
posted for 11.3.01 & the appell-
ant was not present

On 10.4.01; the file was
sent to Iber with the following
note, ~~of the case~~ & the
appellant is in jail serving
out

out a term of imprisonment.
The Dy Comr has dismissed
him from the Shanbhogi
office on the score of in
-competency"

(Sd) M.S
10-4-01

(1st cri order thereon)

"Is his incarceration
due to any irregularity
connected with the discharge
of his duties as Shanbhog.
Ask the Dy. Comr to produce
him after his discharge
from gaol"

(Sd) V.P.M.
11-4-01.

The Dy Comr in his letter
No 1195 dated 9.5.01, reports
in reply, that it was re-
-ported by the Amildar that
the appellant was prosecuted
to conviction in 2 cases of
criminal mis-appropria-
-tion of Kandayam collected
by him from Ryots; that
in one case he was sen-
-tenced to 6 months' simple
imprisonment and in
the other case to 3 months'
rigorous imprisonment;
and that a notice has
been issued to the appellant
through the officer in

charge of the Mysore in
Jail requiring him to
appear before Govt
after his release from
Jail

15.5.01

Part A.

1. Petition (taking area into consideration the time taken for the preparation of copy)
2. Stamp Papers used (Duffk.)
3. Appeal against the order of lower dealing the dismissal of the petition and the appointment of Amildar to the Shanbhogi of Mundakalli Pirka

Rs. 2-12-0

(4) Does not appear to be correct as per Court Fee Act

Sub D 20 Mundakalli

9/7/98

Rs. 9.30 A
10.7.98

Call for the report and send a reminder to the charge of keeping the accounts in the Taluq office by the Sheristadar

11.7.98

11/7/98

Dm.

12/7/98

13/7/98

1898

No. 3113 56 98-99

Name of Petitioner Venkata Lamandah

Village Mundakalli

Taluk

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 28-6-98

Date of Receipt 30-6-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

ABSTRACT

This is an appeal against order No 665-32-2-98 of the Dy. Comr of the Mysore District, ordering the appointment of another in place of the appellant to discharge the duties of the Shanbhogi office of Mundakalli Pirka.—

The order appealed against is as follows—

"In the inquiry of the petitioner and the Shanbhogi both of whom appeared before me, the defects of the Shanbhogi were disclosed. He had

Shanbhogue has entered in the Register of Lands, site against the name of the petitioner charging assessment thereon, while he was not in possession of the same. (b) That though the said amount of the petitioner's land was collected and entered in Kirdi on the 1st of September, yet the Shanbhogue, instead of noting the same in the fatta of the petitioner, contrary to Kirdi, has given a separate receipt to the petitioner entering in it as if the said amount was collected on the 20th September. That notwithstanding the petitioner has not substantiated that the Shanbhogue recovered from him 3-3as more than was due, yet as he seems to be ~~[illegible]~~ and ~~extortion~~, the Shanbhogue may be supposed to have recovered in excess from him. That the Shanbhogue stated besides that he was appointed to the office 6 years back & that he was learning his work by the aid of a gumasta. That on examining him he was found illiterate. And that it was improper that he was appointed Shanbhogue. It could not be understood how the matter was allowed

to lie over for such a long time without being reported by you. This Shanbhogue is old and is unfit to discharge the duties of the office. He should be served with a notice calling upon him to produce a competent claimant or if such claimant be a minor, a gumasta on his behalf within a fortnight. If he fails to produce the required person within the given time, let him be removed from the appointment, another man be selected for the place & a report be submitted on the same.

(2) The depositions of the petitioner & the sujanars of the sites should be taken to know the owners of the sites & the Khata be altered accordingly.

(3) On a perusal of the enclosed records relating to the sale, it is observed that the sale notification sent to the Shekdar on 20-7-47 for

publication was not duly published prior to the 1st of September is the date of sale. The Shekdar has noted in pencil in the receipt book of the petitioner under the head Jamabandi Rs 2-15-0 which was actually collected. The Shekdar's explanation on these points should be obtained & submitted with your opinion. The disposition of the Mamlatdar, the receipt-book and a stray receipt are herein enclosed."

The appellant urges the following grounds against this decision—

That the said sites were in the enjoyment of the petitioner & his brothers, while they were undivided; but subsequently, partition took place & none of the brothers applied for a change of Khate; consequently the said sites remained in the name of the petitioner; therefore the survey name is wrong in thinking that the appellant included sites in the name of the petitioner while he was not in enjoyment of the same.

That the Shekdar neglected to hold the sale of the pensioner's land on the 1st of Sept. 1897 and to escape punishment for neglect of duty arranged with the defaulter to pay up the arrears due, which the latter paid up on the 20th Sept. 1897. That the appellant entered the amount in Kirdi on the same date. That the Head-Gumasta in the Taluq Office to screen the Shekdar from punishment took the Kirdi book away from the appellant's hands & got entries made in it by a peon to the effect that the amount was received on the 1st Sept. 1897. That therefore the whole of the sale proceeds are tampered with by the Taluq Officials

That the appellant has been discharging the duties of the Shanbogi Office for the last 2 years satisfactorily

That the Sy. bour's charges against the appellant are groundless.

And he prays that the Sy. bour's order may be

Cancelled & file be restored
to the Headhopi office.

MG
4/7/90



3113

Two rupees stamp affixed

Forwarded to Deputy Commissioner Mysore for favour of disposal

29/6/98

(3)

In the Court of the Revenue Commissioner to the Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Miscellaneous Revenue Appeal No. 1897-8.



Appellant: — Venkata Ramanan
Shanbhogue, Sandarasi
Shirka, Kodmarallihonni
Mysore Taluk.

The Appellant above-named most respectfully begs to appeal to this honorable Court against the order No. 100 dated 24-2-98 passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District (ordering the appointment of another in place of the Appellant to discharge the duties of the Thandhaga Patel) for the following among other reasons: —

(1) That the charge preferred against the Appellant and mentioned in item No. (2) in the order (herewith attached) is groundless. He alleged that the vacant sites alluded to therein are not Poramboke the

enjoyment of the petitioner herein referred to although they are entered on his name in the 'Kathai'. The Appellant begs to explain (as he has already done before the Deputy Commissioner and the Taluk Authorities) that the said sikes were in the enjoyment of the petitioner therein referred to and his brothers while they were all in the undivided state and subsequent to the partition amongst them the said sikes have gone to the share of the brothers of the said petitioner and as none of the brothers applied for a change of 'Kathai' they still remain in the name of the petitioner as it should be. The Deputy Commissioner without fully examining into the above facts has erroneously ordered that it is found out that the appellant has included sikes in the said petitioners 'Kathai' (accounts) which are not in his enjoyment.

(2) That the charge mentioned in item (b) of the order is not true. The facts are simply

the following :- The duty of the petitioner then referred to were arranged for sale for arrears of Government dues. The sale should have taken place on the 1st September 97. The Treasurer neglected to hold and conduct the sale on the said date. Consequently the Treasurer thinking that he would come to grief for neglect of Government duties acted and arranged with the defaulter to pay up the arrears due and the latter paid up the amount on the 20th September 1897. The Appellant began to enter in the Kirdi the receipt of money on the day when the same was actually received along with many other amounts that were received on the said date i.e. the 20th of September 1897. The Head Gumasta in order to screen the Sheristadar from punishment took the Kirdi book away from the hands of the Appellant and in order to throw the blame on the Appellant got all the entries

made by a Jurandar of the Taluk Office as if the Amount were actually received until 15th September 1921 the Applicant most respectfully submits that he is entirely innocent, that the whole proceedings have been tampered with by the Taluk Officials and all this will be clear if this Honorable Court will please send for the proceedings and inspect and peruse the same.

3) That the charge in item(c) is also not true. The petitioner referred to therein fined in a random petition to the Deputy Commissioner. He never cared to prosecute the same further. The Deputy Commissioner did not enquire whether the petition was true or fictitious but simply believes the same to be true. This shows how and in what degree the District Authorities are prejudiced by the Taluk Authorities against the petitioner. The appellant was not favored with copies of proceedings applied for by

him for explaining the case fully before this Honorable Court.

(4) That it will be clear from the above that all the charges framed against the appellant are groundless.

(5) That the appellant has been discharging the duties of the Shanbhogue's office without being said that he is unfit to do the same.

(6) That the Deputy Commissioner's order is improper & unjust & contrary to facts and probabilities of the case.

(7) That the appellant prays that this Honorable Court will after inspecting and perusing the records, reverse the order of the Deputy Commissioner and restore the appellant to his office of Shanbhogue.

ಅಪೀಲುದಾರನ ಸಹಿ

Bangalore.
20th June 1903.

Pet 33 P 2 60 15-7-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 3113 dated 28-6-98 received at the Dewan's Office from Venkataramaniah of Munda- both in the Mysore Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr, Mysore dismissing petitioner's the Shanbhog's office of Mundahalli petn

is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

3. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

2. The attention of the Dy Commr is invited to the Charge Rules regarding the accounts in the Taluk offices by the Head Sheristadar

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE, 11-7-98

15/7/98

16

13-7-98

La 56-97-3

Subd Precis ordy
mkf
17.11.99

Rec'd. 24-11-99
Precis finished 6-12-99
RK

Subd with precis
mkf
7.12.99

Rd 7 Rec.
19.12.99

1899 [illegible]

GENERAL DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 315
NOV 15 1899
Ger No 13
MAHARAJA'S OFFICE

From

The Deputy Commissioner

3

Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 11th
Despatched } November 1899
Received

Enclosures No. 1 letter & 2 papers

General No. 433.

Reporting on the petition of Venkataramaniah of Mandakalli in the Nanjanagud Taluk.

Petn N
15.11.99

Rec'd
16/11

Reps putup

AK
16/11/99

No. 433

Enclosures No. Note of Peon's Expenses

OFFICE OF THE Dy Commr
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 11 November 1899.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

Adverting to your official memorandum No. Sec 33/16 dated 15th July 1899 forwarding for report a petition from Venkataramanna of Mundakalli in the Mysore Taluk, appealing against this office order dismissing him from the Shanbhogi office of Mundakalli finka I have the honor to state as follows:-

On the 6th November 1897, one Marisidda of Kapparla village in the Mysore Taluk addressed a petition to this office complaining of the recovery of an excess amount of Kandayam from him by the appellant and the Hobli Sheikdar under a threat that they would get his Complainants lands attached and sold by public auction. The petition was referred to the Amildar for disposal by endorsement but the enquiry held by him being considered defective I went for the parties and examined

examined them as also the accounts of the village.

The Shanbhog (appellant) was found guilty of the undermentioned irregularities:-

(a) that he improperly included in Harisidda's (Complainant) Kharia the assessment due on certain vacant sites which were not in the enjoyment of the latter.

(b) that having received from the Complainant on 1st/4 September 1897 the sum given for the sale of his land a sum of Rs 7-1-0 in payment of the arrears outstanding against him and duly credited the same in the Khirdi account under that date, the Shanbhog (appellant) failed to give an acknowledgment therefor in the Complainant's Datta (Receipt Book) but subsequently granted a loose receipt to the latter in which he (appellant) entered the date of payment as the 20th September 1897 and

(c) that he (appellant) recovered from Complainant Harisidda annas three in excess of what was due by the latter.

During his examination before me on the 23rd February 1898 the appellant who was of age and who has been Shanbhog for six years

admitted that he was unacquainted with accounts and that he had been getting them prepared by a Gumasta. He found him unfit for his work and thought it unsafe to keep him as shanbhog.

Under the foregoing circumstances he passed an order dated 24th February 1898 directing the appellant's removal from office and the appointment of a competent person in his place if within 15 days after due notice he should fail to nominate a qualified heir or relative to the post.

In his appeal petition to Government the appellant has, for the first time, stated that the Taluk Head-Gumasta got the date of payment altered in the Khirdi account in order to screen the Hobli Sheikdar from the punishment which he (Sheikdar) had rendered himself liable to for neglecting to hold the sale of mariseedad land on the appointed date viz. 15th September 1897. This allegation is groundless and is clearly the result of an after-thought on the part of the appellant who made no accusation of the kind either in the statement given by him before the amildar or in that taken from him in his office before the order appealed

4

against was passed by me. Further the appli-
cant has not, for reasons best known to
himself, produced the Khiari account for an
examination of the entries with a view to
ascertain the truth or otherwise of his accusation.
He has probably suppressed the same, thinking
that its production might be damaging to his
cause. He makes an unfounded assertion that
the Head Gumasta took the Khiari from him
but did not return it, while the Head Gumasta
denies having ever received the account from the
appellant.

The Vernacular records connected with
the case as per accompanying ferish are sub-
mitted for reference and the enclosures of your
memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honorable,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

Meatta
for Deputy Commissioner

Mysore Division

Compared

(4)

1901

From

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore. Rev & Genl: Depttt

To

The Deputy Commissioner Mysore District.

Dated 12th April 1901

Despatched

Received

General No. 8276

No. C 7437 / 1900

Engineer's No.

(1550)

In 56-97-5

With reference to his letter No 4338 / 11.11.99 reporting on the appeal of Venkatramanah dismissed Shanbhog of Nandkalli in the Mysore Taluk, has the honor to request that he will be so good as to report whether Venkatramanah's incarceration was due to any irregularity connected with the discharge of his duties as Shanbhog, ~~and also to produce him after his discharge from jail.~~

B. O

Draft

Yes

14/4/01

To the Secretary

Lr 56-9706

190 90 07

Ld with prec in continued

GR. No. 7635
MAY 10 1901
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From

The Deputy Commissioner of
the Mysore District

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue
Departments.

Dated 9th
Despatched } May 1901
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 1115

Submitting a brief report in Connection with the appeal of Venkata-ramaih, dismissed Shanbogue of Mandakalli in the Mysore Taluk

Mdly
15-5-01 To lie over till the pet^r appears according to the notice served on him

15/5/01

Pet^r appeared before me today. Post this to the 15th inst^t for the Revl. hearing

20/9/01

Subd to 2nd Council
27-10-1901

Read Report dated
Submitted 2nd Oct
6/12/01.

Read.
6-12-

Dewd
10/11/01

Pet^r
10.5.01

Rd 11-5-01

Rd 10/12/01

Rd 13/5/01

Mr Mirle Raofra asks
of Press
14.5.01 Noon 15.5.01
Press continues
15/5
15-5-01

No. 1115

Enclosures No.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.

MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated 8th May 1901.

Camp T. Narasipur.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No. 82/6
P. 7. 49-1900
dated 15th April 1901, calling for certain infor-
mation in connection with the appeal of
Venkataramaniah, dismissed Shanbhog of
Kandakuli in the Mysore Taluk, I have the
honor to State that the Amildar reports
that the appellant was prosecuted to convic-
tion in two cases of criminal misappropria-
tion of Kandayam collected by him from ryots.
In one case he was sentenced to 6 months sim-
ple imprisonment and in the other case to 3
months rigorous imprisonment. It is also
reported that a notice has been issued to him,
through the officer in charge of the Mysore Jail re-
questing him to appear before Government
after his release from jail.

I have the honor to be Sir,
your most obedient Servant,

K. R. Venkatarama Aiyangar
Asst. Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Before the Govt. Esqrs

Present

V. Madhava Rao Esqr. C.I.E.

and

C. Sreeniviengar Esqr

Appellant

Venkatramanayya

Shanbhog.

Appeal No 56 of 1898-99.

Subject

Appeal against the order of the Dy Commr Mysore Dist, removing him from the Shanbhogs office of Mandikal fitta in Mysore Taluk.

Facts of the case:-

On 6th November 1897, one Muniadda of Kopparlu village in Mysore Taluk, complained to the Deputy Commissioner of the recovery of ~~taxes~~ Candayam from him by the appellant and the Amildar Shekdar, under a threat that the complainants lands would be attached and sold. The Dy Commr found the appellant, on enquiry, guilty

In 56-97-98

Draft for approval
Sent to Govt
20/12/07.

RD
20/12/07
1244

Camp
Gowribidnur

In case of grant
Dy Secy. Govt

Agree
24/12

Secy

24/12/07

Govt pass order
6/1/08

To be printed

(1) of including in the
Complainant's Khata
the assessment due on
certain waste sites
which were not in his
enjoyment and (2) of
receiving, as shown by
the Khirdi, from the
Complainant on 1st
Septr 1897, the date fixed
for the sale of his lands,
a sum of Rs 7-1-4 in
payment of the arrears
outstanding against him,
but for which no acknow-
ledgment was made
in the Complainant's patta
and only a loose receipt
in which the date of
payment was entered
as 20th Septr 1897 was
furnished to him. The
Dy Collector further found
on personal Examination
that the appellant was incompetent
by reason of his ignorance
of the village accounts.
He therefore dismissed

the appellant on account of incompetency and the several irregularities brought home to him and required the appt. to nominate a qualified heir or relative to the Shanbhogi office.

Decision

Court declines to interfere. The appellant was properly dismissed on the ground of incompetency and also for other reasons.

No 1328 & 10/1902
dt 43-00

Copy forwarded to the Dy Commr. Mysore Dist together with the records rect'd on the 1st
No 433 dt 11-11-99

Dupty Secretary

72

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore, Petition, dated 10th January 1902.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

PRESENT:

V. P. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., C. I. E.

AND

C. SREENIVASIENGAR, ESQ.

Appeal No. 56 of 1898-99.

Appellant—Venkataramanaiya, Shanbhog.

Subject.

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, removing him from the shanbhogi office of Mandikal firka in Mysore Taluk.

Facts of the case.

On 6th November 1897, one Marisidda of Koppalur village in Mysore Taluk complained to the Deputy Commissioner of the recovery of kandayam in excess of what was properly due from him by the appellant and the hobli shekdar, under a threat that the complainant's lands would otherwise be attached and sold. The Deputy Commissioner found the appellant, on enquiry, guilty (1) of including in the complainant's khate the assessment due on certain vacant sites which were not in his enjoyment and (2) of receiving, as shown by the khirdi, from the complainant on 1st September 1897, the date fixed for the sale of his lands, a sum of Rs. 7-1-0 in payment of the arrears outstanding against him, but for which no acknowledgment was made in the complainant's patta and only a loose receipt in which the date of payment was entered as 20th September 1897, was furnished to him. The Deputy Commissioner further found on personal examination that the appellant was incompetent by reason of his ignorance of the village accounts. He therefore dismissed the appellant on account of incompetency and the several irregularities brought home to him and required the appellant to nominate a qualified heir or relative to the shanbhogi office.

Decision.

Government decline to interfere. The appellant was properly dismissed on the ground of incompetency and also for other reasons.

No. 1328—P. F. 43-00, DATED BANGALORE, 10TH JANUARY 1902.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, together with the records received with his No. 433, dated 11th November 1899.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Exd.—J.T.B.

1901-1902

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 10th January 1902

No. 1328
P. F. 43-00

Declining to interfere with the order of the Deputy Commissioner dismissing Venkataramanaiya from the shanbhogi office of Mandikal firka, Mysore Taluk, on account of his incompetency and other irregularities.

SBP—21-1-02—200